

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's November 15, 2002, Official Action and respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following comments.

Claims 1-8 have been cancelled in favor of new claims 9-16 which remain in the application for consideration.

Enclosed herewith are corrected figs. 1-9 amended in red for the Examiner's approval.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, Applicant has labeled Figs. 1 and 2 as being prior art, deleted the underlining identified by the Examiner in 1, 6, 8 and 9 and renumbered Figs. 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 to be respectively Figs. 9, 8, 7, 5, 4 and 3.

The renumbering of the figures makes the corresponding description consistent with the newly numbered figure including the elements shown in the figure. Accordingly, elements W and V6 are now properly described in the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that the objections to the drawings has now been overcome.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the specification and rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicant has enclosed a new substitute abstract and cancelled claims 1-8 in favor of new claims 9-16 which have been drafted to eliminate each of the

problems identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that this objection and rejection have now been overcome.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 9-16, claims 1-8 under the doctrine of double patenting, Applicant has enclosed a terminal disclaimer terminating any patent protection granted under any patent granted on this application beyond the terminal date of U.S.P. 6,420,512. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection especially as applied to new claims 9-16.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching in Kobayashi of an upright cylindrical tube and a cylindrical jacket provided concentrically on and around said tube. Clearly, the jacket 13 of Kobayashi is neither on or concentric to tube 3 nor does Kobayashi teach a plurality of such tubes and jackets within the apparatus as set out in the dependent claims.

The Kobayashi arrangement clearly does not provide the advantageous effect derived from the claimed construction set out on page 6, line 9 through page 8, line 24 of the specification since jacket 13 does not insulate tube 3 in the same manner that the claimed jackets insulate the tubes they surround. Accordingly, Applicant


respectfully submits that claims 9-16 define over Kobayashi and are therefore allowable.

Applicant submits that the invention is new and unobvious and not disclosed by the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner's early review and issuance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By


Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:btd

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\N\Niiz\akimoto4\pto\Amd feb03.doc